



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/822,548	03/30/2001	Matthew D. Wood	42390P10451	7654

7590

04/19/2005

Michael A. DeSanctis
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP
Seventh Floor
12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026

EXAMINER

PYZOCHA, MICHAEL J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2137

DATE MAILED: 04/19/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/822,548	WOOD ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Michael Pyzocha	2137	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 March 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9, 17-20 and 25-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9, 17-20 and 25-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

h

Art Unit: 2137

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-9, 17-20, and 25-30 are pending and claims 21-24 are canceled.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

4. Claim 17 is unclear due to the phrasing of line 3. Particularly "to initialize the PRNG, to obtain local..." where it is unclear where the obtaining of local seeding information is part of the initialization.

5. Any claims not specifically addressed are rejected based on their dependencies.

Claim Objections

6. Claims 18 and 19 objected to because of the following informalities: the phrase "to generate the" in line 2 would

Art Unit: 2137

read more clearly as "generate the". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 1-3, 5-9, 17-20, 25-27, 29-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matyas, Jr. et al (US 6687375), further in view of Chen et al (US 6182220) and further in view of Hardy et al (US 6073242).

As per claims 1, 17 and 25, Matyas Jr. et al discloses initializing a pseudo-random number generator (PRNG); obtaining local seeding information from a host; obtaining additional seeding information; and stirring the PRNG with the local seeding information and the additional seeding information (see column 9 lines 19-34 and 45-67).

Art Unit: 2137

Matyas Jr. et al fails to disclose securely obtaining additional seeding information from one or more remote entropy servers.

However, Chen et al teaches obtaining seeding information from one or more remote entropy servers (see column 1 line 66 through column 2 line 9).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to obtain the additional seeding information of Matyas Jr. et al from the server of Chen et al.

Motivation to do so would have been too update passwords on the server (see Chen et al column 4 lines 15-39).

The modified Matyas Jr. et al and Chen et al system fails to disclose the communication between host and server being secure.

However, Hardy et al teaches secure communications (see column 3 lines 54-67).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use Hardy et al's method of secure communications in the modified system of Matyas Jr. et al and Chen et al system.

Art Unit: 2137

Motivation to do so would have been to provide confidentiality, authentication and integrity to the communications (see column 3 lines 54-67).

As per claims 2-3 and 26-27, the modified Matyas Jr. et al, Chen et al and Hardy et al system discloses the initializing the PRNG comprises initializing the internal state of the PRNG with a random value that is a seed (see Matyas Jr. et al column 9 lines 19-34).

As per claims 5 and 29, the modified Matyas Jr. et al, Chen et al and Hardy et al system discloses the one or more remote entropy servers maintain random state pool to supply the host with the random value (see Matyas Jr. et al column 9 lines 45-67).

As per claim 6-8, the modified Matyas Jr. et al, Chen et al and Hardy et al system discloses the securely obtaining seeding information from the one or more remote entropy servers may include using a privacy protocol, wherein the privacy protocol comprises secure sockets layer (SSL) protocol and transport layer security (TLS) protocol (see Hardy et al column 3 lines 54-67).

As per claims 9 and 30, the modified Matyas Jr. et al, Chen et al and Hardy et al system discloses the stirring the PRNG

Art Unit: 2137

comprises producing a cryptographically random stream of bits (see Matyas Jr. et al column 9 lines 45-67).

As per claim 18, the modified Matyas Jr. et al, Chen et al and Hardy et al system discloses the local system generates local seeding information (see Matyas Jr. et al column 9 lines 45-67).

As per claim 19, the modified Matyas Jr. et al, Chen et al and Hardy et al system discloses the one or more remote systems generate remote seeding information (see Chen et al column 1 line 66 through column 2 line 9).

As per claim 20, the modified Matyas Jr. et al, Chen et al and Hardy et al system discloses the entropy servers are hardware or software (see Chen et al column 4 lines 40-54).

9. Claims 4 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the modified Matyas Jr. et al, Chen et al and Hardy et al system as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of AASAA et al (JP 08037138).

As per claims 4 and 28, the modified Matyas Jr. et al, Chen et al and Hardy et al system fails to disclose the securely obtaining seeding information from the one or more remote entropy servers is repeated for redundant entropy servers.

However, AASAA et al teaches the method of repeating a process for redundant servers (see translated abstract).

Art Unit: 2137

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use AASAA et al's method of obtaining information from two servers in the modified Matyas Jr. et al, Chen et al, and Hardy et al system.

Motivation to do so would have been to compare the responses from both servers (see AASAA et al abstract).

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's arguments filed 03/28/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues: Matyas teaches away from using multiple seed values, Matyas alone or in combination fails to disclose stirring the PRNG with the local seeding information and the additional seeding information, Chen fails to disclose remote entropy servers, and Hardy fails to disclose securely obtaining additional seeding information from the one or more remote entropy servers.

Regarding Applicant's argument that Matyas teaches away from using multiple seed values, Matyas teaches in column 9 lines 20-23 that one or more secret seed values are used.

Regarding Applicant's argument that Matyas alone or in combination fails to disclose stirring the PRNG with the local seeding information and the additional seeding information,

Art Unit: 2137

Applicant is directed to column 9 lines 45-67 where the mixing step corresponds to the stirring step.

Regarding Applicant's argument that Chen fails to disclose remote entropy servers, however Chen is related to a client-server system for providing entropy and by definition in the client-server system the server is remote from the client (see FOLDOC definition).

Regarding Applicant's argument that Hardy fails to disclose securely obtaining additional seeding information from the one or more remote entropy servers, Chen is relied upon for obtaining additional seeding information from the one or more remote entropy servers and Hardy teaches that a secure connection can be made which allows for secure communications.

Conclusion

11. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS

Art Unit: 2137

of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Pyzocha whose telephone number is (571) 272-3875. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00am - 4:30pm first Fridays of the bi-week off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Caldwell can be reached on (571) 272-3868. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2137

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MJP

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Andrew Caldwell", with a stylized flourish at the end.

**ANDREW CALDWELL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**